REMARKS

Claims 1, 4-18 and 20 are pending. The Examiner's reconsideration of the rejections is respectfully requested in view of the amendments and remarks.

Applicant appreciates entry of the previous amendments – accordingly the prior objections are believed to have been withdrawn.

Claims 1-12, 15-18 and 20 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Bala (US Patent App. 2004/0130572). The Examiner stated essentially that Bala teaches or suggests all the limitations of Claims 1-12, 15-18 and 20.

Claims 1 and 18 claim, *inter alia*, "simultaneously performing an alignment and generalization of the plurality of steps, wherein the alignment identifies and aligns steps that are equivalent once generalized, wherein simultaneously performing the alignment and generalization of the at least one trace further comprises computing a set of possible alignments and generalizations of the at least one trace, and selecting an alignment and a generalization from the set of possible alignments and generalizations according to an alignment-generalization functional that determines a rate at which the steps of the procedure are correctly predicted for the set possible alignments and generalizations." Claim 20 claims, *inter alia*, "selecting a generalized and aligned user action to represent a respective user action of the at least one trace using an alignment-generalization functional that determines a rate at which a selected generalized and aligned user action correctly predicts user actions of the trace; and generating the one or more computer-executable procedures executable by the computer system consistent with the selected generalized and aligned user action."

Bala teaches a method for predicting what wizard a user may need (see paragraph [0051]). Bala does not teach "selecting an alignment and a generalization from the set of possible alignments and generalizations according to an alignment-generalization functional that determines a rate at which the steps of the procedure are correctly predicted for the set possible alignments and generalizations" as claimed in Claims 1 and 18, nor "selecting a generalized and aligned user action to represent a respective user action of the at least one trace using an alignment-generalization functional that determines a rate at which a selected generalized and aligned user action correctly predicts user actions of the trace" as claimed in Claim 20. Bala teaches a method for predicting what task a user is performing and providing a predetermined wizard to perform the task. Bala's disclosure of an authoring tool is limited to paragraphs [0030-0031]. Bala's teachings with respect to the authoring tool fail to teach "an alignment-generalization functional that determines a rate at which the steps of the procedure are correctly predicted for the set possible alignments and generalizations" as claimed in Claims 1 and 18 or selecting a generalized and aligned user action to represent a respective user action of the at least one trace using an alignment-generalization functional that determines a rate at which a selected generalized and aligned user action correctly predicts user actions of the trace" as claimed in Claim 20.

Bala's teachings with respect to how to navigate a wizard are clearly not analogous to the claimed inventions; for example, nothing in the description of how the wizards function teach how a computer-executable procedures are generated.

Therefore, Bala fails to teach all the limitations of Claims 1, 18 and 20.

Claims 4-12, 15-17 depend from Claim 1. The dependent claims are believed to be allowable for at least the reasons given for Claim 1. Claims 2-3 have been canceled.

Reconsideration of the rejection is respectfully requested.

Claims 13 and 14 have been rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over <u>Bala</u> in view of <u>Horvitz</u> (USPN 6,009,452). The Examiner stated essentially that the combined teachings of <u>Bala</u> and <u>Horvitz</u> ('452) teach or suggest all the limitations of Claims 13 and 14.

Claims 13 and 14 depend from Claim 1. The dependent claims are believed to be allowable for at least the reasons given for Claims 1. Reconsideration of the rejection is respectfully requested.

Claims 1, 18 and 20 have been rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over <u>Horvitz</u> (USPN 6,021,403) in view of Admitted Prior Art (APA). The Examiner stated essentially that the combined teachings of <u>Horvitz</u> ('403) and APA teach or suggest all the limitations of Claims 1, 18 and 20.

Applicant re-iterates that, the material cited in the rejection has not been labeled as "prior art," nor has the material been ascribed to another. Accordingly, the material is not believed to be prior art for purposes of a rejection under 35 USC 103(a); see MPEP 2129 citing *Reading & Bates Construction Co. v. Baker Energy Resources Corp.*, 748 F.2d 645, 650, 223 USPQ 1168, 1172 (Fed. Cir. 1984) ("[W]here the inventor continues to improve upon his own work product, his foundational work product should not, without a statutory basis, be treated as prior art solely because he admits knowledge of his own work. It is common sense that an inventor, regardless of an admission, has knowledge of his own work."). The Examiner has not presented a statutory basis that the cited passage can be ascribed to another, therefore, the material is not believed to be prior art for purposes of a rejection under 35 USC 103(a).

As noted in the rejection, <u>Horvitz</u> does not explicitly disclose simultaneously performing an alignment and generalization of the plurality of steps, wherein the alignment identifies and aligns steps that are equivalent once generalized. Therefore, <u>Horvitz</u> fails to teach all the limitations of Claims 1, 18 and 20.

The Examiner's reconsideration of the rejection is respectfully requested.

For the forgoing reasons, the present application, including Claims 1, 4-18 and 20, is believed to be in condition for allowance. The Examiner's early and favorable action is respectfully urged.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: February 25, 2008   By: /Nathaniel T. Wallace/
                                                    Nathaniel T. Wallace
                                                    Reg. No. 48,909
                                                    Attorney for Applicants

F. CHAU & ASSOCIATES, LLC
130 Woodbury Road
Woodbury, New York 11797
TEL: (516) 692-8888
FAX: (516) 692-8889